

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
. 09/827,255		04/05/2001	Jeffrey Tze Fei Wong	1441830001336	4343
34879	7590	06/12/2003			
	& MCKE		EXAMINER		
	•	CHISON HOUSE AD, CENTRAL	SCHMIDT, MARY M		
HONG KONG, .					
	HONG KONG			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1635	
				DATE MAILED: 06/12/2003	7 A
					ه ۱

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/827,255	WONG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mary M. Schmidt	1635
Th MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 05 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (a condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application 1) a timely filed amendment which	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forted later than SIX MONTHS from the mails AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date o (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding and the shortened statutory period for replace later than three months after the materials.	nount of the fee. The appropriate extension y originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	·	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims were		•
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 9</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a)☐ approved or b)☐ disap	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·
10. ☐ Other:	•	



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Although applicant's amendment to claims 1 and 9 overcomes a portion of the 35 U.S.C. 112, scope of enablement rejection of record for the breath of liposomes claimed, ie. applicant amended to claim liposomes with a molar ratio of PC:Chol:PS or 11:4:0.025, the amendment does not overcome the breath of "therapeutic agents" claimed for administration for treatment purposes. The use of the language "therapeutic" in regards to the administered compounds implies a treatment effect upon administration and thus the enablement rejection states over the breath of claimed drugs or polynucleotides claimed. For the reasons of record (see the Office action mailed 8/6/02) there is a high level of unpredictability in the art for administration of any compound to a whole organism for therapeutic reasons. As such, one of skill in the art would be required to practice an undue amount of experimentation to make and use the breath of claimed therapeutic compounds instantly claimed. The claims as amended thus remain rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, scope of enablement for the breath of therapeutic compounds claimed, and is only considered enabled for the administration of doxorubicin for treatment purposes for the reasons set forth in the previous Office actions.

JOHN L. LEGUYADER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600